Dakota

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

SEP 24 1970
E. ROBERT SEAVER, CLERK
Supreme Court, U. S.
FILED
APR 24 1972
MICHAEL RODAK, JR., CLERK

October Term 1970

No. 45 Original

STATE OF WASHINGTON, STATE OF ILLINOIS,
STATE OF ARIZONA, STATE OF COLORADO,
STATE OF HAWAII, STATE OF IOWA,
STATE OF KANSAS, STATE OF MAINE,
COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
STATE OF MINNESOTA, STATE OF MISSOURI,
STATE OF OHIO, STATE OF RHODE ISLAND,
STATE OF VERMONT, AND
COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,

Plaintiffs,

v.

GENERAL MOTORS CORPORATION,
a Delaware corporation,
FORD MOTOR COMPANY,
a Delaware corporation,
CHRYSLER CORPORATION,
a Delaware corporation,
AMERICAN MOTORS CORPORATION,
a Maryland Corporation, and
AUTOMOBILE MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION,
a New York corporation,


Defendants.

MOTION FOR ORDER OF COURT GRANTING
LEAVE TO PETITIONER TO JOIN CAUSE
AS PARTY PLAINTIFF


THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA, a sovereign state of the United States of America, by and through its Attorney General, petitions the Court for an Order granting the State of North Dakota leave to join as a party plaintiff in the above entitled cause, and for leave to adopt, endorse and re-affirm the Motion For Leave To File Complaint, Brief in Support, thereof, and Complaint heretofore filed in this cause by Plaintiff states herein, and in support thereof asserts: that the right to relief sought herein by the State of North Dakota is the same as sought in this proceeding by the States of Washington, Illinois, Kansas, Maine, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Minnesota, Misscuri, Ohio, Rhode Island, Vermont, and the Commonwealth of Virginia, co-plaintiffs in this cause, concern the

same occurrences and presents common questions of law and fact.

Respectfully submitted,



Counsel for Petitioner
Helgi Johannëson
Attorney General; and



Paul M. Sand
First Assistant
Attorney General
State Capitol
Bismarck, North Dakota

No. 45 Original

OCT 3 1970

E. ROBERT SEAVER, CLERK

# In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1970

**STATE OF WASHINGTON, et al.,**

*Plaintiffs,*

vs.

**GENERAL MOTORS CORPORATION, et al.,**

*Defendants.*

## BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE COMPLAINT


WALTER J. WILLIAMS
14250 Plymouth Road
Detroit, Michigan 48232

and

FORREST A. HAINLINE, JR.
CROSS, WROCK, MILLER & VIESON
Penobscot Building
Detroit, Michigan 48226

*Attorneys for Defendant American Motors Corporation.*

LLOYD N. CUTLER
HOWARD P. WILLENS
JAY F. LAPIN
WILMER, CUTLER & PICKERING
900 — 17th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

and

JULIAN O. VON KALINOWSKI
PAUL G. BOWER
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER
634 South Spring Street
Los Angeles, California 90014

*Attorneys for Defendant Automobile Manufacturers Association, Inc.*

G. WILLIAM SHEA
PHILIP K. VERLEGER
McCUTCHEN, BLACK, VERLEGER & SHEA
615 South Flower Street
Los Angeles, California 90017

*Attorneys for Defendant Chrysler Corporation*

ROBERT L. STERN
ROGER W. BARRETT
MAYER, BROWN & PLATT
231 South LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60604

and

CARL J. SCHUCK
ERNEST E. JOHNSON
OVERTON, LYMAN & PRINCE
550 South Flower Street
Los Angeles, California 90017

*Attorneys for Defendant Ford Motor Company*

ROSS L. MALONE
ROBERT A. NITSCHKE
General Motors Building
Detroit, Michigan 48202

and

HAMMOND E. CHAFFETZ
WILLIAM R. JENTES
KIRKLAND, ELLIS, HODSON, CHAFFETZ & MASTERS
Prudential Plaza
Chicago, Illinois 60601

and

MARCUS MATTSON
RICHARD F. OUTCAULT, JR.
LAWLER, FELIX & HALL
605 West Olympic Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90015

*Attorneys for Defendant General Motors Corporation.*


SORG/CHICAGO U.S.A.

# INDEX


| | PAGE |
|---|---|
| Question Presented | 1 |
| Statement | 2 |
| 1. The Background of Industry and Governmental Efforts to Control Auto Pollution | 2 |
| 2. The Related Government and Private Suits Involving Auto Pollution | 6 |
| 3. The Present Proceeding | 9 |
| Argument | 11 |
| 1. Plaintiffs Have a Suitable Alternative Forum in Other Courts | 11 |
| 2. The Facilities of the District Courts Are Better Adapted to Complex Trials of Factual Issues Than Those of This Court | 14 |
| 3. Invocation of This Court's Original Jurisdiction is not Required to Insure the Expeditious and Fair Handling of this Matter | 17 |
| a. The alleged saving in time from an original action is illusory | 17 |
| b. Plaintiffs do not need an original action in this Court to secure a single unified trial | 19 |
| 4. There is No Public Need for the Exercise of This Court's Original Jurisdiction | 20 |
| Conclusion | 24 |